



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ST  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/476,708	12/30/1999	IANNE MAE HOWARDS KORITZINSKY	GEMS:0036-1/	8181

7590 07/26/2002

PATRICK S YODER  
7915 FM 1960 WEST  
SUITE 330  
HOUSTON, TX 77070

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ROSEN, NICHOLAS D

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/476,708	KORITZINSKY ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Nicholas D. Rosen	3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 59-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 59-78 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Claims 59-78 have been examined.

***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: the "graphical service center telephone directory 218" mentioned on page 23 of the specification, lines 5 and 6. Furthermore, even if the feature were present, it could not be assigned the element number 218, since this is the number of the "system reports page" shown in figure 9, (page 23, line 11). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings, or else correction to the specification, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 77 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the second line of the claim, "wordstation" appears to be an error for "workstation". Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3625

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 74-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (U.S. Patent 5,891,035). As per claim 74, Wood discloses a system for providing operational protocols to a medical diagnostic station or institution, the system comprising: at least one storage device for storing data defining a protocol, the protocol including data for controlling operation of the diagnostic station (column 2, lines 8-19 and 30-49; column 7, lines 1-46); a messaging module in the diagnostic station or the institution for formulating messages containing data descriptive of a desired protocol (column 7, lines 20-29); and communications circuitry for establishing a network link between the diagnostic station or institution and a remote protocol provider, for transmitting data descriptive of the desired protocol, and for receiving a reply from the remote protocol provider (column 2, lines 8-19 and 30-49; column 3, line 27, through column 4, line 16; column 7, line 1, through column 8, line 4).

As per claim 75, Wood discloses that the communications circuitry is configured to access the Internet and to transmit the data descriptive of the desired protocol in a message via the Internet (Abstract; column 7, lines 20-29).

As per claim 76, Wood discloses that the messaging module is provided on the medical diagnostic station (column 3, lines 11-38; column 5, lines 42-54; column 7, line 1, through column 8, line 4; Figure 3).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Claims 59-68**

Claims 59-61, 64, 66, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. (U.S. Patent 5,891,035) in view of Reeder (U.S. Patent 5,852,812). As per claim 59, Wood discloses a method for providing operational

Art Unit: 3625

protocols to medical diagnostic systems, the method comprising the steps of: storing a protocol on a machine readable medium, the protocol including at least one operating parameter for a medical diagnostic system (column 2, lines 8-19 and 30-49; column 7, lines 1-43); displaying user viewable indicia descriptive of the protocol at a medical diagnostic location (column 2, lines 8-19 and 30-49; column 7, line 1, through column 8, line 4); and performing a protocol exchange transaction including selecting the protocol via a user interface and loading the protocol at the medical diagnostic location from the machine readable medium via a network connection to the medical diagnostic location (column 6, line 15, through column 8, line 4; Figures 1 and 2). Wood does not disclose storing an accounting record of the transaction, but Reeder teaches doing this (column 14, lines 25-37). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to store an accounting record of the transaction, for the stated advantage of billing users for downloading files (of which protocols are an example).

As per claim 60, Reeder teaches that the accounting record includes data for invoicing fees associated with downloading a file (column 14, lines 25-42). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have the accounting record include data for invoicing fees associated with the protocol, for the obvious advantage of profiting from charging such fees.

As per claim 61, Wood does not disclose transmitting an authorization prompt to the medical diagnostic location prior to loading the protocol, but official notice is taken that it is well known to transmit authorization prompts. Hence, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to transmit an authorization prompt to the medical diagnostic location prior to loading the protocol, for the obvious advantage of causing the user to authorize loading the protocol, thus enabling the protocol supplier to charge for loading the protocol, and also avoiding the complaints, ill will, and possible legal liability apt to arise from loading protocols without authorization.

As per claim 64, Wood does not expressly disclose that the user viewable indicia include a textual description of the protocol, although Wood's words at column 7, lines 27-33, and column 7, line 59, through column 8, line 4 are quite suggestive. It appears improbable that a user of Wood's system would download a protocol new to the user with no textual description of the protocol; even in the case of a protocol familiar to the user, a textual description would be helpful for identifying the protocol, distinguishing it from other available protocols, and reminding the user of exactly what it did. In any event, official notice is taken that it is well known for indicia to include textual descriptions of programs or products (e.g., catalog entries). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have the user viewable indicia include a textual description of the protocol, for the obvious advantage of enabling the user to conveniently acquire information about the protocol.

As per claim 66, Wood discloses that the user viewable indicia are viewed at a computer workstation coupled to the medical diagnostic system, at least in the sense that the medical diagnostic system includes features which qualify it as being, or including, a computer workstation (Figures 1 and 3; column 3, lines 11-40).

As per claim 68, Wood discloses that the network connection can include the Internet (Abstract; column 7, lines 20-26).

Claims 62 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood and Reeder as applied to claim 59 above, and further in view of Wyman (U.S. Patent 5,260,999). As per claim 62, Wood does not disclose verifying a service subscription of the medical diagnostic location, the accounting record referencing the subscription, but Wyman teaches verifying a service subscription of a site seeking to use a program (column 6, line 43, through column 7, line 40) an accounting record referencing the subscription (column 7, lines 12-30 in particular). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to verify a service subscription of the medical diagnostic location, and have an accounting record reference the subscription, for the obvious advantages of avoiding providing protocols to users who have not paid for subscriptions, and checking protocols downloaded against subscribers, particularly in the case of what Wyman terms a consumptive style, where a subscription allows only a limited number of downloads.

As per claim 63, Wyman teaches that subscriptions are time-expiring subscriptions (column 27, lines 4-11; note also references to "duration" in Abstract and column 7, lines 3-40). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention for the subscription verified to include data representative of a time-expiring subscription, for the obvious advantage of avoiding the unwanted giveaway of protocols for which a subscription had expired.

Claim 65 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood and Reeder as applied to claim 59 above, and further in view of Clarke et al. (U.S. Patent 5,982,917). As per claim 65, Wood does not disclose that the user viewable indicia include an exemplary image obtainable via the protocol, but Clarke displays exemplary images obtainable via the protocol of his invention (Figures 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9; associated text in columns 5 and 6 describing these figures). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have the user viewable indicia include an exemplary image obtainable via the protocol, for the obvious advantage of demonstrating what the protocol can do.

As per claim 67, Wood does not disclose that the protocol includes data for filming, viewing, reconstructing, or processing images reconstructed from image data, but Clarke teaches data for filming, viewing, reconstructing, or processing images (Figures 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9; associated text in columns 5 and 6 describing these figures). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have the protocol include data for filming, viewing, reconstructing, or processing images reconstructed from image data, for the stated advantage (see Clarke, Abstract) of enhancing the analysis of images, and thus, for example, better distinguishing malignant from benign masses.

### **Claims 69-73**

Claims 69 and 71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. (U.S. Patent 5,891,035) in view of Reeder (U.S. Patent 5,852,812). As

per claim 69, Wood discloses a method for obtaining an operational protocol for a medical diagnostic system or institution, the method comprising: performing a transaction by accessing data from a protocol library defining the desired protocol via a network link between the diagnostic system or institution and the library, and transmitting the data from the library to the diagnostic system (column 7, lines 1-58). Wood does not expressly disclose ordering a protocol by viewing a protocol list on a user interface at the medical diagnostic system, and selecting a desired protocol from the list, but does disclose referencing preferred presets (protocols) from an HTML page for retrieval over the Internet or another network (column 7, lines 20-26), which comes close. Moreover, official notice is taken that it is well known to view lists of products or files that may be ordered, and select the desired item from the list. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to order a protocol by viewing a protocol list on a user interface at the medical diagnostic system or institution, and selecting a desired protocol from the list, for the obvious advantage of conveniently learning what protocols are available, and obtaining the most suitable protocol.

Wood does not disclose storing a record of the transaction, but Reeder teaches storing a record of a transaction (the transaction comprising downloading a file; column 14, lines 25-37). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to store a record of the transaction, for the stated advantage of billing users for downloading files, of which protocols are an example.

As per claim 71, Wood does not expressly disclose transmitting data descriptive of the protocol to the medical diagnostic system for addition to the protocol list, but official notice is taken that it is well known to transmit descriptive data with files or programs. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to transmit data descriptive of the protocol to the medical diagnostic system, for the obvious advantage of enabling the user to easily determine which protocol was which.

As per claim 72, Wood does not disclose authorizing a fee for the protocol, but Reeder teaches charging a fee for downloading a file (column 14, lines 25-42), from which authorizing a fee is held to be obvious, since attempting to charge people fees which they have in no way authorized would in many cases lead to complaints, refusal to pay, and possible litigation or prosecution. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to authorize a fee for the protocol, for the obvious advantage of collecting fees without these difficulties.

As per claim 73, Wood discloses that the network link can include the Internet (Abstract; column 7, lines 20-26).

Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood as applied to claim 69 above, and further in view of the admitted prior art. Wood contains no indication that the protocol list includes protocols for anything except a modality of the medical diagnostic system (ultrasound), from which it is held to be obvious for the protocol list to include only protocols for a modality of the medical diagnostic system. Wood does not disclose that the library includes protocols for a plurality of diagnostic

Art Unit: 3625

system modalities, but it is admitted prior art that there are a plurality of diagnostic system modalities with respective protocols (the instant application, page 1, line 22, through page 2, line 25). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention for the library to include protocols for a plurality of diagnostic system modalities, for the obvious advantage of enabling users of a plurality of diagnostic systems to obtain suitable protocols.

### **Claims 77 and 78**

Claims 77 and 78 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. (U.S. Patent 5,891,035) as applied to claim 74 above. As per claim 77, Wood does not expressly disclose that the managing module is provided on a computer workstation networked to the medical diagnostic station within the institution, except in the sense that the medical diagnostic system includes a computer workstation (Figures 1 and 3; column 3, lines 11-40). However, aside from the issue of whether the claim language is met by something networked to itself, official notice is taken that it is well known for various devices to be networked to computer workstations. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention for the computer workstation on which the messaging module is provided to be networked to the medical diagnostic station within the institution, for the obvious advantage of enabling the computer workstation to be used to control the diagnostic equipment, acquire data from the diagnostic equipment, and obtain protocols to be used with the diagnostic equipment, without need for the computer workstation and the

Art Unit: 3625

diagnostic equipment to be physically joined, a distinct advantage for one wishing to use the computer workstation with several workstations, or to put it to other uses (e.g., word processing) as well as connecting it to medical diagnostic station(s).

As per claim 78, Wood does not expressly disclose that the storage device is local to the remote protocol provider, but neither does Wood suggest that the storage device is not local to the remote protocol provider. Official notice is taken that it is well known for storage devices to be local to remote providers (e.g., disks and other memories in servers). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention for the storage device to be local to the remote protocol provider, for the obvious advantage of enabling the remote protocol provider to have convenient access to the protocols it was to provide.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 6,188,407) disclose a reconfigurable user interface for a modular patient monitor.

McWilliams (WO 95/32573) discloses a file transfer mechanism.

The article "Esso inforer firmagebyr," (English language abstract) discloses an invoicing fee.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen, whose telephone number is 703-305-0753. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

Art Unit: 3625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins, can be reached on 703-308-1344. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and for After Final communications. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 703-746-5574.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

*Nicholas D. Rosen*

Nicholas D. Rosen

July 23, 2002